

REMARKS

In the last Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, and 10-12 were rejected on the basis of prior art, and claims 3, 5-9 were objected to as depending on a rejected claims but would be found allowable if placed in proper form. Also, claim 4 was indicated as being allowable if re-written to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, and also placed in proper form.

Accordingly, claim 1 was amended to include the limitations of claims 2 and 3, so that claim 1 should be found allowable.

Claim 4 (indicated as having allowable subject matter) has been cancelled and re-written as independent claim 21.

Claim 5 (indicated as having allowable subject matter) has been cancelled and re-written as independent claim 22.

Claim 6 (which formerly depended upon claim 5) has been amended to depend upon claim 22, so this should be found allowable.

Claim 7 (depending upon claim 6) is unamended.

Claim 8 (indicated as having allowable subject matter) has been cancelled and re-written as independent claim 23.

Claim 9 (which had depended upon claim 8) has now been amended to depend upon claim 23, so this should be found allowable.

Claims 10, 11, and 12 which were rejected on prior art have been cancelled.

Claims 13 – 20 which are non-elected claims, have thus been withdrawn from consideration.

Claim 24 is a newly submitted claim, and in paragraph “f” of claim 24 there is recited the positioning of the first over-running drive connection as being connected between the sprocket section and the pedal section, and

the second over-running drive connection operatively positioned at the power assist drive section. This is not shown in the Turner patent, nor in the other references cited.

Claim 25 is a newly submitted claim, and this relates to the basic configuration and further recites the limitations which are contained in original claim 8 which was indicated in the last Office Action as being allowable.

Claim 26 is a newly submitted claim which recites basically the same subject matter as claim 1 was originally submitted, and also contains the limitations of claim 3 which was previously indicated as allowable, but does not include the limitation of the intervening claim 2, which states that the power assist drive member is concentrically mounted around the crank shaft. This arrangement also is not shown in the Turner patent.

If there is any matter which could be expedited by consultation with the Applicant's attorney, such consultation would be welcome. For example, it may be that in order to expedite prosecution, the Examiner may wish to discuss with the Applicant's attorney, the undersigned, specifically how the language of the claims may relate to the various components of the system of the present application, and how these distinguish from the apparatus shown in the Turner patent. If so, the Applicant's attorney would certainly wish to cooperate in that manner. The Applicant's attorney can normally be reached at the telephone number set forth below.

Signed at Bellingham, County of Whatcom, State of Washington, this
October 24, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,
HAROLD SPANSKI,

By 

Robert B. Hughes, Reg. No. 19,304
Hughes Law Firm, PLLC
Pacific Meridian Plaza
4164 Meridian Street, Suite 302
Bellingham, WA 98226
(360) 647-1296
Fax (360) 671-2489